

# UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



SECURITY  
COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

A/35/301  
S/14015  
9 July 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
Thirty-fifth session  
Item 27 of the preliminary list\*  
QUESTION OF NAMIBIA

SECURITY COUNCIL  
Thirty-fifth year

Letter dated 20 June 1980 from the President of the United  
Nations Council for Namibia to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you the attached text of the report of the Mission of Consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to Australia and New Zealand, which visited those countries from 7 to 15 May 1980.

In conformity with the decision of the Steering Committee at its 111th meeting, held on 12 June 1980, I should like to request that the report of the Mission of Consultation be circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under item 27 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Paul J. F. LUSAKA  
President of the United Nations  
Council for Namibia

\* A/35/50.

# ANNEX

## Report of the Mission of Consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia to the South Pacific Region - Australia and New Zealand

(7 to 15 May 1980)

Chairman: Mr. Orhan Eralp (Turkey)

### CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction . . . . .	1 - 5	2
II. Consultations with the Government of Australia . . . .	6 - 21	2
III. Consultations with the Government of New Zealand . . .	22 - 33	5

### APPENDICES

I. Press statement issued by the Mission in Canberra on 14 May 1980 . . . . .	1 - 13	8
II. Press release issued by the Mission in Wellington on 9 May 1980 after consultations with Foreign Ministry officials of the Government of New Zealand . . . . .	1 - 13	11
III. Specific issues raised with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand . . . . .	1 - 8	14

/...

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. By its resolution 34/92 of 12 December 1979, the General Assembly authorized the United Nations Council for Namibia to send Missions of Consultations in 1980 to Member States of the United Nations, prior to the holding of the extraordinary plenary meetings by the Council in Africa.

2. Subsequently, the United Nations Council for Namibia decided to send a mission to the Governments of Australia and New Zealand.

3. The Mission was composed of the following members:

Mr. Orhan Eralp	(Turkey), Chairman
Mr. Abdelhamid Semichi	(Algeria)
Mr. Louis Fobe	(Belgium)
Mr. Vijay K. Nambiar	(India)
Mr. Enrique Buj-Flores	(Mexico)
Mr. Cherif Bachir Djigo	(Senegal)
Mr. M. Tjitendero	(South West Africa People's Organization)

Mr. J. M. Sechele and Ms. Estela Yopez of the United Nations Secretariat accompanied the Mission as Principal Secretary and Secretary respectively.

4. The Mission visited New Zealand from 7 to 9 May and Australia from 11 to 14 May 1980.

5. Attached to this report are three appendices: two press releases issued after consultations with both the Governments of Australia and New Zealand and a set of questions posed to those Governments.

## II. CONSULTATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF AUSTRALIA

6. The Mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia visited Australia and held consultations with the officials of the Australian Government from 11 to 14 May in Canberra.

7. The Mission was received by the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. M. J. R. MacKellar, M.P., by the members of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Australian Parliament, and by the Acting Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. A. R. Parsons.

8. The Mission held consultations with an official delegation of the Government of Australia, led by Mr. C. R. Ashwin, First Assistant Secretary for International Organizations, Africa and Middle East Division, and included other officials from the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Defence and the Office of National Assessments.

/...

9. In his introductory remarks, the Chairman of the Mission posed specific questions to the officials of the Australian Government with regard to the following issues:

(a) The policy position of the Australian Government towards the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which has been recognized by the Organization of African Unity and the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia;

(b) The position of the Government in the event that South Africa continues to employ dilatory tactics with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan and thereby leave the United Nations with no alternative but to take measures with a view to imposing economic sanctions against South Africa;

(c) The question of armed struggle which is being waged by SWAPO;

(d) The views of the Government in the event South Africa declares an internal settlement in Namibia;

(e) The illegal activities of foreign companies doing business in Namibia in partnership with South Africa and the need for the enforcement of Decree No. 1 adopted by the Council for Namibia in 1974; a/

(f) The attitude of the Government towards the separation of Walvis Bay from Namibia by South Africa;

(g) The need for assistance to Namibians through several programmes initiated by the Council for Namibia.

10. In responding to these questions raised by the Chairman of the Mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Australian officials informed the Mission that the Australian Government held views similar to those of the United Nations Council for Namibia, since Australia was a member of the Council. However, there were a few elements which the Australian Government did not accept. These were that, although recognizing the central role which SWAPO would continue to play as a major factor in the political equation in Namibia, Australia did not agree with the designation of SWAPO by the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia. The Australian Government also did not believe that the use of violence was necessarily the correct method to resolve the conflict in Namibia.

11. The officials informed the Mission that Australia strongly deplored the delaying tactics of South Africa with regard to the implementation of the United

---

a/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 24A (A/9624/Add.1), para. 84. The Decree has been issued in final form in Namibia Gazette No. 1.

Nations plan, and believed that South Africa had adopted a two-way approach whereby it continued to talk to the United Nations while, on the other hand, it was proceeding with preparations for an internal settlement. In that context, the delegation of the Australian Government assured the Mission that Australia could never recognize the results of an internal settlement because its Government regarded the presence of South Africa in Namibia as illegal.

12. On the question of economic sanctions against South Africa, the Australian Government believed that there was need for patience. It believed that South Africa needed time to study the developments which led to the independence of Zimbabwe and the resultant policy direction in that country. They were of the view that precipitous action by the United Nations to take punitive measures against South Africa would have the effect of alienating South Africa and hindering a solution through negotiations. However, the officials of the Australian Government stated that South Africa should not expect the United Nations to remain patient for ever without ultimately having to apply the machinery available to it in order to compel South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia. They observed that while SWAPO had made several concessions, South Africa had taken a devious position which amounted to no concessions at all.

13. The officials of the Australian Government informed the Mission that Australia had offered a group of engineers and a monitoring unit to the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group. They deplored South Africa's military presence in Namibia and its incursions in Angola and other independent African countries.

14. The Government believed that, at independence, Walvis Bay should be an integral part of Namibia. The delegation of the Government informed the Mission that Australia had been among the first countries to recognize the travel document issued to Namibians by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

15. The delegation informed the Mission that Australia had maintained a policy of no sporting contests between its athletes and those of South Africa and believed its position to be in conformity with those of the Commonwealth and the United States.

16. The delegation deplored the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources and informed the Mission that so far as it was aware, no Australian companies were doing business in Namibia.

17. The delegation of the Australian Government informed the Mission that its Government had allocated a sum of \$A 50,000 for the current fiscal year for the training of Namibian students. It contributed to several southern African scholarship programmes, including a yearly contribution to the Fund for Namibia and to the Commonwealth Scholarship Programme, from which they believed Namibian students would continue to benefit. It said that the Australian Government welcomed Namibian students to study in Australia and that there were five Namibian students who were currently studying in Australia.

18. The Chairman of the Mission thanked the Australian officials for their

/...

Government's keen interest in the question of Namibia and the assistance offered to Namibians.

19. In the afternoon of 14 May, the Chairman of the Mission and the representative of SWAPO addressed a press conference organized by the Australian Government at the Parliament Building and attended by the representatives of radio and television of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and Agence France Presse.

20. The Mission was invited to observe a Parliamentary debate in the House of Representatives and the Senate. In both instances, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, respectively, acknowledged and announced the presence of the Mission.

21. While in Sydney, the Chairman of the Mission and the representative of SWAPO addressed a press conference organized by the officials of the United Nations office.

### III. CONSULTATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

22. The Mission visited New Zealand from 7 to 10 May 1980. The Mission was received by and held consultations with the Minister of State and leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. D. S. Thomson, and with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mr. F. H. Corner, who was accompanied by other officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

23. The Mission also paid courtesy calls on the representative of the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, Mr. A. J. Faulkner, and the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee, Mr. P. I. Wilkinson.

24. During the consultations held between the officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Mission, the leader of the Mission posed specific questions to the officials of the New Zealand Government with regard to the following issues:

(a) The position of the New Zealand Government towards SWAPO as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia;

(b) The views of the New Zealand Government in the event that South Africa continues to employ dilatory tactics with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan and thereby leaves the United Nations with no alternative but to take measures with a view to imposing economic sanctions against South Africa;

(c) The question of armed struggle which is being waged by SWAPO;

(d) The position of the New Zealand Government in the event that South Africa declares an internal settlement in Namibia;

(e) The illegal activities of foreign companies doing business in Namibia in partnership with South Africa, and the separation of Walvis Bay from Namibia by South Africa.

/...

25. In responding to some of the questions, the officials of the New Zealand Government informed the Mission that their Government's position was that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and therefore any action by South Africa in Namibia, including the possibility of an internal settlement by South Africa, would be illegal. The New Zealand Government could not, therefore, recognize the result of such a move as a solution to the question of Namibia, and the outcome of an internal settlement would, in their view, be invalid.

26. The New Zealand officials reaffirmed the policy of their Government that a negotiated solution to the question of Namibia should provide for the inclusion of Walvis Bay in the Territory of a free and united Namibia.

27. They deplored South Africa's delaying tactics with regard to the implementation of the United Nations plan and stated that the vacillation of South Africa could not be allowed to continue indefinitely.

28. The officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in responding to the question of the recognition of SWAPO, said that the New Zealand Government did not recognize SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibian people because it believed that only through free and fair elections held under United Nations auspices could the wishes of the Namibian people be made known. They were, however, convinced that SWAPO was an important organization in Namibia and were pleased to have the assurance of the representative of SWAPO that his organization was prepared to contest, on an equal footing with other parties, free and fair elections under United Nations auspices. In this context, the officials referred to the recent elections in Zimbabwe.

29. The officials doubted the effectiveness of sanctions since these had not worked in the case of Rhodesia. However, they were aware of the fact that South Africa was a major violator of those sanctions.

30. The officials informed the Mission that their Government had reservations on the use of violence as a means of settling disputes. They noted the explanation given by the representative of SWAPO, that armed struggle was not an end in itself, but part of a larger struggle which involved political as well as diplomatic efforts on the side of SWAPO in its quest to achieve genuine national independence. Armed struggle, the representative of SWAPO said, became necessary only when all other avenues were closed. The SWAPO representative went further to explain to the New Zealand government officials that, although his organization was recognized by the majority of the international community, SWAPO, appreciating this hard-won and deserved recognition, had not become capricious about its status since it had expressed its readiness to subject itself to the will and desire of the people of Namibia through elections, which must be free and fairly held under the supervision and control of the United Nations.

31. The New Zealand government authorities, in reiterating their position that their Government accepted the United Nations Council for Namibia as the only legal body of the United Nations to administer Namibia, also thanked the Mission for

/...

the useful direct contact it had undertaken by visiting their country. They said that although they were not in a position to answer all the questions during the consultations, they would give careful consideration to the issues raised.

32. The leader of the Mission thanked the officials for the warm welcome it had received and for the contribution made by New Zealand to the Fund for Namibia; the Mission hoped that more generous contributions would be made not only to the Fund but to other programmes which the United Nations Council for Namibia had initiated to assist Namibians until independence was achieved.

33. In the afternoon of the same day, the leader of the Mission addressed a press conference which was organized by the New Zealand authorities and was covered by representatives from Television New Zealand and the New Zealand Press Association, which syndicates to all New Zealand papers.

#### APPENDIX I

Press statement issued by the Mission in Canberra on  
14 May 1980

1. With the agreement of the Government of Australia, a Mission of Consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia visited Canberra from 11 to 14 May 1980. The Mission was led by the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations and included representatives of Algeria, Belgium, India, Mexico, Senegal and SWAPO. Two United Nations staff members also accompanied the Mission.
2. During its visit to Australia, the Mission was received by the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Honourable M. J. R. MacKellar, M.P., by the members of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Australian Parliament and by the Acting Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. A. R. Parsons.
3. The Mission also held consultations with an official delegation of the Government of Australia, headed by Mr. C. R. Ashwin, First Assistant Secretary for International Relations, Africa and Middle East Division, and which included officers from the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Defence and the Office of National Assessments.
4. In his introductory remarks, the Chairman of the Mission covered the entire spectrum of problems relating to the question of Namibia, a question which had affected the conscience of the international community. He stressed the history of South Africa's contempt for the United Nations, her intransigence and utter refusal to comply with or implement the resolutions and other decisions of the United Nations on Namibia.
5. The Mission gave an in-depth analysis of the situation in Namibia throughout the history of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa and stated that available evidence had demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt that South Africa had no intention of unconditionally withdrawing from Namibia. The Australian delegation reiterated the position taken by the Australian Government that the South African presence in Namibia was illegal and that all the acts of the South African administration were therefore illegal.
6. Both sides expressed their grave concern that the continued illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia and its continued use of Namibia to stage attacks on independent African countries was fraught with dangerous implications for the region and Africa as a whole. The Mission believed that throughout the talks between the United Nations and South Africa, South Africa had used the talks to diminish the role of the United Nations and undermine SWAPO, which has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and had sought to gain recognition for the so-called internal parties with a view to promoting the idea of an internal settlement in Namibia. In that context, the Mission emphasized the need for the Member States of the

/...

United Nations to refrain from according any recognition to the so-called internal settlement in Namibia and to recognize the central role which must be played by SWAPO in any meaningful negotiations which would lead to an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia.

7. The Mission explained that the international community could no longer tolerate continued equivocation on the part of the illegal South African régime vis-à-vis the implementation of resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) of the Security Council as well as the subsequent initiatives to which both the front-line countries as well as SWAPO have already responded positively. The South African authorities should now be presented with a definite deadline within which to respond to these initiatives, failing which the Security Council should consider punitive measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Australian delegation agreed that the international community could not be expected to wait much longer for South Africa to declare its acceptance of the United Nations plan, and hoped that it would do so soon while the climate for a negotiated settlement was particularly propitious.

8. The Australian delegation and the Mission discussed at length the importance of maintaining the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, and reaffirmed the concept of Namibia acceding to independence as a unitary state. The Australian delegation reaffirmed that Walvis Bay should be an integral part of an independent Namibia.

9. The Mission expressed its serious concern over the continued illegal exploitation of Namibian uranium and other resources by foreign companies which work in partnership with the racist and illegal Government of South Africa in Namibia, in utter violation of Decree No. 1, which was enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, of other relevant decisions of the General Assembly, and of Security Council resolutions 283 (1970) and 301 (1971) regarding the natural and human resources of Namibia.

10. In this context, the Mission drew the attention of the Government of Australia to the massive exploitation of Namibian uranium at the Rössing Mine and the possible utilization of this uranium by South Africa to build its military technology to the detriment of the Namibian people and other neighbouring African peoples. The Mission expressed its concern that such a trend could lead to a rapid development of nuclear capability by South Africa, which would be a threat not only to the security of the region but to international peace and security at large.

11. The Mission condemned South Africa for its duplicity and prevarication with regard to the need for the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and praised the statesmanlike manner in which SWAPO had expressed its readiness to participate in a free and fair election under the supervision and control of the United Nations as stated in Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

/...

12. The Australian delegation reaffirmed its full support of the United Nations Council for Namibia including its diplomatic efforts to bring international pressure upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw from its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia. Both sides reiterated the position of the General Assembly that the United Nations Council for Namibia is the only body with the authority legally to administer Namibia until the Territory accedes to genuine national independence.

13. The Mission expressed its appreciation for the warm welcome it had received from the Government of Australia. It paid special thanks to the Government of Australia for the generous contributions which that Government had made to the Fund for Namibia. It expressed the desire of the Council that as long as the question of Namibia was not resolved, Member States would continue to increase their financial contributions to the Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme, and to other programmes for Namibia which the General Assembly may set up to assist Namibians at this trying stage in their struggle for national independence. The well-known position of the Government of Australia in the work of the Council and at the United Nations had been a source of strength to the United Nations Council for Namibia in its task against racist and occupationist South Africa.

## APPENDIX II

Press release issued by the Mission in Wellington on  
9 May 1980 after consultations with Foreign Ministry  
officials of the Government of New Zealand

1. With the agreement of the Government of New Zealand, a Mission of Consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia visited Wellington from 7 May to 9 May 1980. The Mission was led by the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations and included representatives of Algeria, Belgium, India, Mexico, Senegal and SWAPO. Two United Nations staff members also accompanied the Mission.
2. The Mission was received by and held consultations with the Minister of State and Leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. D. S. Thomson, and with the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mr. F. H. Corner, accompanied by other officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
3. It also paid courtesy calls on the representative of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. A. J. Faulkner, and the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee, Mr. P. I. Wilkinson.
4. In his introductory remarks, the Chairman of the Mission covered the entire spectrum of the problem of the question of Namibia and its characteristics which have affected the conscience of the international community. He stressed the history of South Africa's contempt for the United Nations, her intransigence and utter refusal to comply with or implement the resolutions and other decisions of the United Nations on Namibia.
5. The Mission gave an in-depth analysis of the situation in Namibia throughout the history of the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa and stated that available evidence had demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that South Africa had no intention of unconditionally withdrawing from Namibia. The New Zealand representatives reiterated the position taken by the New Zealand Government that the South African presence in Namibia was illegal and that all acts of the South African administration were therefore illegal.
6. The Mission believed that throughout the talks between the United Nations and South Africa and other interested parties, South Africa had used the talks to diminish the role of the United Nations, undermine SWAPO which has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and had sought to gain recognition for some non-representative groups within the country with a view to promoting the idea of an internal settlement in Namibia. In that context, the Mission emphasized the need for the Member States of the United Nations to refrain from according any recognition to the so-called internal settlement in Namibia and to recognize the central role which must be played by SWAPO in any meaningful negotiations which would lead to an internationally acceptable solution to the question of Namibia. New Zealand reiterated its position that any internal settlement in Namibia would be invalid

/...

7. The Mission emphasized the grave concern of the international community at the continued illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia and its continued use of Namibia to stage attacks on independent African countries. This constituted a serious threat to international peace and security and was fraught with dangerous implications for Africa as a whole.
8. The Mission discussed at length with the Government of New Zealand the importance of maintaining the territorial integrity and unity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay, and emphasized that Namibia should accede to independence as a unitary state. The New Zealand Government reaffirmed that a negotiated solution to the question of Namibia should provide for the inclusion of Walvis Bay in the Territory of a free and united Namibia.
9. The Mission expressed its serious concern over the continued illegal exploitation of Namibian uranium and other resources by foreign companies which work in partnership with the racist and illegal Government of South Africa in Namibia, in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974, of other relevant decisions of the General Assembly and of Security Council resolutions 283 (1970) and 301 (1971) regarding the natural and human resources of Namibia.
10. In this context, the Mission drew the attention of the Government of New Zealand to the massive exploitation of Namibian uranium at the Rössing Mine and the possible utilization of this uranium by South Africa to build its military technology to the detriment of the Namibian people and other neighbouring African peoples. The Mission believed that such a trend could lead to a rapid development of a nuclear capability by South Africa, which would be a threat not only to the security of the region but to international peace and security at large.
11. The Mission stressed that South Africa should be condemned for its duplicity and prevarication with regard to the need for the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and praised the statesmanlike manner in which SWAPO had expressed its readiness to participate in free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations, as stated by Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).
12. The Mission drew the attention of the New Zealand Government to the need for its full support for the United Nations Council for Namibia and for its programme of work, including its diplomatic efforts to bring international pressure upon the Government of South Africa to withdraw from its illegal occupation of the Territory of Namibia under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Each side reiterated the position that the United Nations Council for Namibia is the only legal body established by the General Assembly to administer Namibia until the Territory accedes to genuine national independence.

/...

13. The Mission expressed its appreciation for the warm welcome which it had received from the Government of New Zealand. It paid special thanks to the Government of New Zealand for the generous contributions which that Government had made to the Fund for Namibia. It expressed the desire of the Council that, as long as the question of Namibia was not resolved, Member States would be required to continue to increase their financial contributions to the Fund for Namibia, the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme for Namibia, and to other programmes which the General Assembly may in the future set up to assist Namibians at this trying stage in their struggle for national independence.

/...

### APPENDIX III

#### Specific issues raised with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand

The Mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia has been given a mandate by the Council to seek the responses of your Government regarding the following issues:

1. As it appears that South Africa is increasingly showing a lack of interest in a negotiated and internationally acceptable settlement of the question of Namibia, what would be the position of your Government should the United Nations decide to specify a time-limit for South Africa's unequivocal response, failing which the United Nations would take punitive measures with a view to imposing economic sanctions against South Africa?
2. All the evidence available to the United Nations Council for Namibia shows that South Africa, by ignoring the resolutions of the United Nations, is making preparations to declare a Rhodesia UDI-type of internal settlement in Namibia and, given the position of your Government that an internal settlement by South Africa in Namibia would not be desirable, is it likely that your Government, in the presence of such a development, might reconsider its position towards SWAPO, which has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the people of Namibia?
3. Given a possible failure in the efforts of the international community to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia, what would be the future position of your Government with regard to the armed struggle which is being waged by SWAPO and has been supported by the Organization of African Unity, the non-aligned movement and the United Nations General Assembly?
4. The Council for Namibia is seriously concerned by the deteriorating situation in Namibia, in particular by the intensive military-build-up by South Africa in the Territory and the constant use of these military units by South Africa against the people of Namibia and for aggressive attacks on neighbouring independent African countries. We would like to learn the views of the Government regarding this military presence of South Africa in Namibia, specifically with respect to its injurious implications for international peace and security.
5. Given the exploitation by foreign companies of the natural resources of Namibia, particularly uranium at the Rössing Mine, we should be interested in the views of your Government with regard to Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, which was adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1974. In that context, we appreciate the efforts of non-governmental organizations and students movements which have called for disinvestiture by foreign companies and other commercial and financial

/...

institutions doing business with South Africa in Namibia, and of trades union movements which have called for a boycott of the handling of goods from South Africa. This, we feel, is a move in the right direction and we hope that Governments will begin to take similar initiatives in the future.

6. The separation by South Africa of Walvis Bay from Namibia, of which it is an integral part, has raised serious concern within the international community, as being a sinister intention on the part of Pretoria to hold the future Government of Namibia to ransom by using its presence in Walvis Bay, and also to ensure a permanent military base in the Bay which would be used as a "watch-dog" against the Government of independent Namibia. We would appreciate the views of your Government with regard to the question of Walvis Bay as an integral and inseparable part of Namibia.

7. The travel document which is issued to Namibians by the United Nations Council for Namibia and has been recognized by some 80 countries, some of which guarantee the right of return, is not only a concrete example of assistance to Namibians, but also a manifestation of the legal authority of the Council over Namibia until independence is achieved. In that context, we would appreciate the views of your Government on this travel document.

8. Finally, we must express the gratitude of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the contributions which your Government has made to the Fund for Namibia and hope that you will continue to make your generous contributions not only to the Fund for Namibia but to the United Nations Institute for Namibia and the Nationhood Programme. These are concrete programmes of assistance to Namibians which will equip them with the skills necessary for the administration of a future independent Namibia.

-----